

ADDENDUM #1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR Milwaukee County

Engineering Services and Final Design Development for the Little Menomonee River Parkway PROJECT NO. 0515-17803

DATE: September 25, 2020

This addendum to the Request for Proposal (RFP) is issued to modify, explain or correct the original documents and is hereby made a part of the RFP. Acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in your Proposal.

The following are revisions to the RFP:

Attachment 5

Replace the TBE specifications form and the TBE commitment form with the attached DBE commitment form (DBE-14).

RFP Section III. SCOPE OF CONSULTANT SERVICES

In Section III. SCOPE OF CONSULTANT SERVICES (p.6-7) under Phase 1A, Point B, the following task is outlined: "Coordinate reviews and any necessary investigations for endangered resources."

In the meeting we mentioned that a new species not listed on the NHI was found in Section 4. This task ultimately remains unchanged. To clarify, additional detail has been added:

B. Coordinate reviews and any necessary investigations for endangered resources

- i. *Based on recent findings within the LMR Corridor, in addition to endangered resources referenced in Phases 1A and 1B, the Consultant will compile background information for the project areas covered under this RFP regarding the potential presence of endangered/threatened species and habitats. The Consultant shall recommend as part of their habitat management plan and wetland scrape design, a technical memorandum that outlines avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures. If applicable, the Consultant shall work with Milwaukee County Parks, WDNR, and EPA on any measures that require additional deliverables or work for Section 7 consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).*
- ii. *This work will be achieved by reviewing the LMRP ERMP, data parks has collected on the species, and management guidance provided by USFWS to create the technical memorandum.*

V. PROJECT SCHEDULE

An amendment has been made to the project schedule taking into consideration the timing needed for wetland delineation. The extension adds an additional quarterly reporting deliverable:

- a. **9/4/2020** Issue Request for Proposal
- b. **9/22/2020** Pre-Proposal Meeting (online)
- c. **10/2/2020** Proposals Due
- d. **10/8/20** Selection Committee selects consultant
- e. **October '20** Consultant award and contract execution
- f. **11/9/20** Notice to Proceed
- g. **November 2020** Prepare QAPP, secure permits and approval
- h. **Nov'20-Jun'21** Develop Habitat Management Plan Sets & Wetland Scrape Design
- i. **1/1, 3/1/2021, 7/1/2021** Quarterly reports submitted to MCP
- j. **July 1, 2021** Project Completion and final report submission

VIII. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:

On pages 9-10 of the RFP submission requirements are outlined. Section **e. Description of Organization's Experience** and Section **m. Natural Areas Management** overlap and have differing numbers for references. The guidance in point e. should be followed. The language in Section **m. Natural Areas Management** has caused confusion and has been modified to the following:

m. Natural Areas Management: *Due to the specialized nature of work related to native plant communities within the park, it is recommended that the consultant and sub-consultant have the following experience:*

- (1) *At least five years of experience overseeing projects of similar scope and scale.*
- (2) *Experience planning habitat restoration work, natural areas ecological restoration and management, and documented experience and wetland design and installation, as well as experience working on federally funded projects and familiarity with reporting requirements (QAPP, Quarterly Reports, etc.).*

In addition, consider the following details when putting together project lists for Section e. Description of Organization's Experience:

- (a) *Type of native plant community and designed for.*
- (b) *Site acreage*
- (c) *Invasive species control methods used and their effectiveness*
- (d) *Wetland design and restoration*
- (e) *Project budgets and timelines*
- (f) *Permit(s) required*

The following are clarifications made during the Pre-Proposal Meeting and are provided as Information Only:

Pre-Proposal Meeting Clarifications

The following questions were raised at the Pre-Proposal meeting on September 22, 2020. The following answers are provided for those questions, including additional clarification in red:

- Q1: May a Milwaukee County TBE certified firm count towards the DBE goal?
A1: The answer is probably no, but we recommend that you contact the Community Business Development Partners Office. There information is found on page 10 of the RFP.
- Q2: Is there a wetland delineation is that current or will we need to redo that as they expire every 5 years?
A2: The selected contractor will need to conduct a wetland delineation.
- Q3: Are you anticipating the need to do contaminated materials investigations?
A3: No
- Q4: There was a preliminary NHI review - do you anticipate the need to do species specific surveys?
A4: No, current NHI reviews, data in the ERMP and held by MCP and the County will suffice.
- Q5: Do we anticipate that the lead federal agency will prepare their own NEPA documentation and will you just use the technical reports that come out of the scope of work?
A5: Yes, EPA will prepare all their own NEPA documentation and utilize the technical reports that are created under this RFP.
- Q6: Will DNR conduct Section 106?
A6: Yes.
- Q7: If we win the bid for design can we do the build?
A7: No, the winning contractor will not eligible to bid on construction at least not as the prime.
- Q8: Since most of the work is anticipated to be completed over winter what is the timeline for survey work?
A8: Late winter, early spring 2021. **Clarification: As noted this has changed with the extended timeline.**
- Q9: USACE takes a different approach. Will a phase 1 archaeological survey be excluded and if it is determined that one is needed would it be acceptable to do a change order?
A9: A phase 1 archaeological survey is currently not required for Sections 4 & 5. One may be required for Section 2 which is not related to this project. **Clarification: If this changes a change order will be acceptable. We recommend including a "miscellaneous allowance" of \$1,000.00 for work that is authorized by Milwaukee County.**

Q10: Since the notice to proceed is after the growing season it will impact the survey time and the current schedule may not be amendable.

A10: **We agree and, as indicated above, have modified the timeline.**

Q10: In the area of the wetland scrape is their detailed information on soil types, groundwater, levels and general hydrology?

A10: Soil maps are provided, but further data compilation including groundwater levels and hydrogeology are required work that the selected contractor will undertake.

Q11: There is information on fisheries improvements in the ERMP that are not in the RFP. Can you provide more information?

A11: Fisheries work is not part of the scope of this project. The scope of this project is just the habitat plan and wetland scrape design described in the RFP. Fisheries design is being conducted by Ozaukee County. As part of the ERMP and, as an ongoing project, is important to be aware of.

Follow-up questions

The following questions were submitted via email after the pre-proposal meeting. The following answers are provided for those questions:

Q1: Are there specific hydrologic or vegetative performance standards the wetland scrape must meet beyond the design goal to achieve a wet-prairie or sedge meadow as outlined in the ERMP?

A1: The ERMP is the guiding document for the standards and requirements. To add more detail - the purpose of the wetland scrape is to have a longer hydroperiod for herptiles referenced within the ERMP.

Q2: Has a hydrology study been completed, have monitoring wells been installed and monitored (number and location?), or is any groundwater data available to assist the design of the wetland scrape?

A2: No, this work has not been done. In order to achieve the goals of final wetland design the proposer shall conduct work that needs to be completed, which includes all the tasks listed in the above questions, as well as wetland delineation and data review.

Q3: Will the County be providing one foot or better topographic contours of the site or will the consultant be responsible for generating the site contours?

A3: The County will provide this.

Q4: Is a wetland delineation required for all of LMR Section 5, or should it be focused on the area of the proposed wetland scrape?

A4: Just the wetland scrape, not all of section 5.

Q5: Since a wetland delineation is required to occur during the growing season, will the project completion date be extended if the growing season does not start sufficiently early to allow completion of Phases 2 and 3?

A5: Yes. See modified timeline.

- Q6: Would MCP consider an extension to the current October 2 proposal deadline?
- A6: There is no extension to the proposal under consideration at this time.
- Q7: Would MCP consider a different contract vehicle and consider issuing a revised RFP for a design/build project?
- A7: Unfortunately, we cannot issue a revised RFP for a design/build. It is not legal in the state of Wisconsin, with a few exceptions
- Q8: In some maps, there appears to be a potential waterway in the area of the proposed wetland scrape. This does not appear to be shown on the wetland map in the RFP. Has this feature been evaluated for navigability by the WDNR?
- A8: First, to allay any concerns, **this feature is not a navigable waterway**. To summarize from the ERMP in the description of Section 5: *There is a severely degraded "scrub/shrub" wetland within the SW grassland restoration area near the intersection of Appleton Avenue and 107th Street. It is hydraulically connected to the LMR through a culvert under the parkway drive* – this is the feature that shows up in some maps.
- Q9: Section VIII. e. requests five example projects conducted by the consultant in the past five years and three references. Section VIII. m. requests at least three project examples and at least three references. Does this mean that we should be providing at least eight total project examples and at least six references or five total project examples and at least three references?
- A9: This is clarified above under revisions to the RFP.
- Q10: Do we need to include a copy of our COVID-19 Pandemic Preparedness Plan in the proposal?
- A10: It's not required for the proposal. The selected firm will be asked to provide a copy as part of the contract process.
- Q10: What is the amount budgeted for the design phase of this project and what is the amount budgeted for the construction phase?
- A10: The design fees are part of the overall project budget and there is not a maximum budget amount. However, MCP estimated the fees for the design phase relevant to this RFP to range between \$35,000-50,000. Please be aware that, per Milwaukee County ordinances, contracts in excess of \$50,000 require supplemental approval. The overall budget, which covers all components of design, implementation/construction, and administration for multiple projects was set at \$2 million dollars.
- Q11: Should we assume that SEWRPC would do the wetland delineation and we would coordinate it, meaning that we would not include costs for performing the wetland delineation, or should we include costs to conduct the wetland delineation ourselves using WDNR Assured Wetland Delineators?
- A11: SEWRPC is not conducting a wetland delineation for this project. They were referenced in relation to another project as an example of a project timeline. As noted above, the selected contractor will be conducted the delineation and costs for this work should be included in your proposals.

End of Addendum No. 1